

REMARKS

Claims 24-32 and 37-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1-23 and 33-36 have previously been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 24, 26 and 30 have been amended herein. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the specification and the figures, see for example, paragraph 0050. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

Favorable consideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants kindly thank Examiner Tyson for the discussion of this application in the telephonic interview with Heidi Dare on January 22, 2010. No demonstration was given during the interview. U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0003161 to Vardi et al. was discussed. No agreement was reached during the interview. Applicants agreed to file an amendment together with an RCE.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Pending claims 24-26, 27, 29 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vardi et al. (U.S. 2001/0003161) in view of Colgan et al. (U.S. 2003/0040789) and claims 28 and 30-32 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Vardi et al. in view of Colgan et al. and Shaknovich (U.S. 5,669,924).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on the combinations of Vardi et al. with Colgan et al. and Shaknovich. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the traversals and the claim amendment discussed below.

Applicants' claim 24 requires independently advancing the second introducer over the second wire guide from the working channel into the main lumen and the second branch lumen of the bifurcation entirely external to the first introducer. Claim 26 requires advancing a second wire guide entirely external to and independent of the first stent. Claim 30 requires distally advancing the second stent entirely external to the first stent and toward the second branch.

Vardi et al., Colgan et al. and Shaknovich have been discussed in detail in Applicants' response filed October 12, 2009. As previously discussed, the method of

Vardi et al. includes advancing a second guidewire through the side sheath received in the second lumen of the dual lumen catheter and out through the side opening in the primary stent. (Abstract.) According to Vardi et al, "As shown in FIG. 5, after distal end 16 of side sheath 14 is positioned as shown, a second guidewire 31 can then be advanced out of distal end 16 of the side sheath 14, passing **through** side opening 27 in stent 25." (Paragraph 0035, see also Paragraph 0020, emphasis added.) The opening 27 in the stent 25 is specifically positioned at the ostium of the branch vessel to direct the second guidewire to the branch vessel. (Abstract.) Clearly, Vardi et al. fails to teach or suggest a second wire guide that is advanced entirely external to the first stent. In addition, Vardi et al. discloses a dual lumen catheter 12 and a side sheath 14, wherein side sheath 14 is slidably received within lumen 15 of the catheter 12. (Paragraph 0028.) In other words, the second sheath or catheter 14 of Vardi et al. is advanced in cooperation with the first catheter 12 by being received through the second lumen of the dual lumen catheter 12 and not entirely external to the catheter 12. (See Paragraph 0010.) Clearly, Vardi et al. fails to teach or suggest that the second introducer is advanced over the second wire guide from the working channel to the main lumen and second branch lumen entirely external to the first introducer as required by claim 24. Vardi et al. also fails to teach or suggest advancing a second wire guide entirely external to and independent of the first stent as required by claim 26 or distally advancing the second stent entirely external to the first stent and toward the second branch as required by claim 30. In addition, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Vardi et al. fails to teach or suggest that the first and second introducers are in a staggered, adjacent, configuration in a working channel of an endoscope. (Page 4, August 13, 2009, Office Action.) As previously discussed, Colgan et al. and Shaknovich, together and individually, fail to make up the deficiencies of Vardi et al.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 24-32 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

III. Summary

Having carefully addressed the Examiner's rejections, Applicants respectfully assert that the application is in condition for allowance. Allowance of the present claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above submissions in more detail, the Examiner is asked to please call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 26, 2010



Heidi A. Dare
Registration No. 50,775
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312)321-42809